UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,589	08/29/2003	Russell W. White	1030-0001	9154
34456 7590 02/11/2008 LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP 5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE SUITE 200			EXAMINER	
			ANDERSON, CATHARINE L	
AUSTIN, TX 7	8730		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/652,589	WHITE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Lynne Anderson	3761	

		Lytine / thactoon	0,01
The MAILING DATE	of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 28 January :	2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.
application, applicant must application in condition for	timely file one of the following rallowance; (2) a Notice of Appe	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request within one of the following time
a) 🔲 The period for reply expi	resmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
no event, however, will the Examiner Note: If box 1 is	e statutory period for reply expire last checked, check either box (a) or (l	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	in the final rejection, whichever is later. In g date of the final rejection.  E FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained have been filed is the date for purpounder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated f	ses of determining the period of ext rom: (1) the expiration date of the s by reply received by the Office later	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as te of the final rejection, even if timely filed,
	filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal	(37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter		avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
(a) ☐ They raise new issue		out prior to the date of filing a brief, nsideration and/or search (see NO w):	
(c) They are not deemed appeal; and/or	d to place the application in bett	•	ducing or simplifying the issues for
	e 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.
		21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
<u> </u>	come the following rejection(s):		(
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amend non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ded claim(s) would be all	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment canceling the
	claims would be rejected is prov s (or will be) as follows: _		ll be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDEN			
	provide a showing of good and	t before or on the date of filing a No I sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered it or other evidence is necessary and
entered because the affida	vit or other evidence failed to o	a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evid REQUEST FOR RECONSIDER.	·	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
	•	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information 13. ☐ Other:	ation <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Tatyana Zalukaeva/ Supervisory Patent Examine	r, Art Unit 3761		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arugment that the color coding of the swabs of D'Alessio do not identify the location of the first cavity, it is noted that a recitation of the functional use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In the present case, D'Alessio teaches color coding the swabs to identify the use of the swab. Since a cavity containing a medicament is associated with one swab, the color that denotes the use of that swab therefore also identifies that the cavity is located at the end of the application system with the colored swab. The color of the swab therefore is capable of identifying the located in the application system of the cavity.

In response to the applicant's argument that one of the swabs of D'Alessio is not associated with a substance at all, it is noted that D'Alessio is relied upon for the teaching of using colored swabs to identify the different ends of the application system. Mark discloses an application system with a substance associated with each swab, and is modified by the teaching of D'Alessio to identify which end is which.

In response to the applicant's argument that D'Alessio does not disclose first and second patterns, it is noted that a solid color is a type of pattern, and therefore since D'Alessio discloses first and second colors, D'Alessio inherently discloses first and second patterns.